```
1
                  IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                  FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
 2
                            Norfolk Division
 3
 4
 5
        UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 6
                                              CRIMINAL ACTION NO.
        V.
                                              2:18cr113
 7
        ADONIS MARQUIS PERRY,
 8
               Defendant.
 9
10
11
                       TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
12
                           Norfolk, Virginia
13
                             March 11, 2020
14
15
     BEFORE: THE HONORABLE REBECCA BEACH SMITH
16
              United States District Judge
17
18
     APPEARANCES:
19
               UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
20
               By: William B. Jackson
                     Joseph DePadilla
2.1
                    Assistant United States Attorney
                     Counsel for the United States
22
2.3
               RIDDICK BABINEAU PC
               By: Jon M. Babineau
24
                     Counsel for the Defendant
25
```

```
(Hearing commenced at 3:05 p.m.)
 1
              THE CLERK: In case 2:18cr113, United States of
 2
 3
     America versus Adonis Marquis Perry.
              Mr. Jackson, Mr. DePadilla, is the government ready
 4
 5
     to proceed?
              MR. DePADILLA: The government is ready.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Good afternoon.
              MR. DePADILLA: Good afternoon.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: Mr. Babineau, is the defendant ready to
10
     proceed?
11
              MR. BABINEAU: I am ready to proceed.
12
              THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Babineau.
13
              Let the record reflect that the defendant, Adonis
14
     Marquis Perry, is here in person for the hearing. There are
15
     a number of matters that have come before the Court this
16
     afternoon, and I'll take them in the order that they have
17
     been filed.
18
              The first was the defendant's motion filed by
19
     counsel, Mr. Babineau, to inquire, and a motion on behalf of
20
     the defendant to appear at the jury trial in jail clothes
2.1
     and restraints. That was filed on February 12th, 2020.
22
              Then there was defense counsel's motion to withdraw
23
     filed on March 5, 2020, and the defense counsel did file a
24
     motion to seal the motion to withdraw. The Court left the
25
     motion to seal and the notice under Rule 49 notice on the
```

public docket, and there was no response and no objections, and the order was entered earlier today.

So we are here before the Court on these motions, and the first motion that the Court will take up, I'll do the motion to inquire together with the motion to withdraw. The first motion would be the motion that you filed,

Mr. Babineau, on the defendant's behalf for him to appear at jury trial in jail clothes and restraints. It requests that he wants the, "...jury to be aware of his custodial status."

That's ECF number 137, which is the motion, and that's at Page 1.

The government has taken no position on the motion but requests that the defendant himself put his request on record at the hearing, and that the Court, while the defendant is under oath, putting his request on the record, remind him that this will not be a grounds for reason of reversal in later proceedings, and that is pursuant to Duarte v. United States, 81 F.3d 75 at 77. That's a Seventh Circuit 1996 case. In other words, the defendant can't make a request and then make his request, which he has verified and pursued under oath, a point of reversal in later proceedings. That would be stressed to the defendant.

The way we will proceed on this motion is, the first thing that I'll do, after making it more of a statement, is to allow Mr. Babineau to present why he filed

the motion and the discussions in this regard. It's a public motion to the Court, and then the Court will, if appropriate, place Mr. Perry under oath and verify that he does wish to appear at trial in his jail clothes. The restraints are another matter, but I will take that up with him.

MR. BABINEAU: Yes, ma'am. In filing that motion, I met with Mr. Perry a number of occasions in the Western Tidewater Regional Jail to review his case, the discovery in his case, and prepare him for trial, which is scheduled the end of this month.

THE COURT: Yes, it is, Tuesday, the 31st.

MR. BABINEAU: So in discussing the trial with him and kind of the indices of trial, I advised him that I was trying to find out what size shirt and pants, shoes, jacket he wore so that I could make sure that I provided him with clothing. I have clothing from lots of other clients who I have represented and I've purchased in the past that I have available, or I could reach out to his family, was the other option I said to him, that I would either buy him the clothes in order to have him properly dressed before the Court, before the jury, or I could reach out to his family.

He became very angry with me relative to that topic and was adamant about the fact that he wanted to appear in jail clothes and shackled because he wanted the jury to know

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

```
what the government has done to him, and that he is not a
free man. He doesn't want to give people the, his quote,
allusion that he is free when he is not free. I explained
to him, obviously, what I felt my opinion was on that and
that I didn't think that was a great idea, but even
notwithstanding that, and this happened on at least two
conversations that we had, he was adamant about me filing
the motion, so I did.
         THE COURT: Thank you.
         Mr. DePadilla, is there anything you want to add
before the Court addresses Mr. Perry on the motions?
         MR. DePADILLA: No, Your Honor.
                                          Thank you.
         THE COURT: We need to place Mr. Perry under oath.
         (Defendant was sworn.)
         THE COURT: Mr. Perry, the Court needs to make a
direct inquiry of you to be sure that the motion and the
representations that have been made to the Court you agree
with them. You've heard what Mr. Babineau has said, that
you wish to appear at your trial in your jail clothing as
well as in the restraints. Is that correct?
         THE DEFENDANT: No.
                              I never even seen any of those
            I don't have any documents to work with. I
didn't even know what I was coming to court for today. I
don't have no documents. I haven't seen none of these
documents.
```

```
will appear in civilian clothing unless you opt to appear in
 1
 2
     your jail clothing.
 3
              THE DEFENDANT: What do you mean?
 4
              THE COURT: Just what I said. I say what I mean,
 5
     and I mean what I say.
              THE DEFENDANT: Well, like I said, I don't
 6
 7
     really -- he filed the motion. I didn't even know anything
 8
     about that. I don't even have a copy of it.
 9
              THE COURT: Well, even assuming that you don't have
10
     a copy of it, I'm telling you that you have a jury trial
11
     coming up March 31. There will be a jury seated in this
12
     jury box, and you can appear before them in jail clothing,
13
     if that's what you determine to do, it is permissible under
14
     Supreme Court law, or you can appear in street civilian
15
     clothing either provided through the Court or your attorney
16
     or your family.
17
              THE DEFENDANT: If I'm in handcuffs and shackles,
18
    how am I going to go over the documents with my case?
19
              THE COURT: You're not going to be in handcuffs
20
    because if you don't request that, the Court isn't even
21
     going to consider it. In any event, I would tell you that
22
     restraints is not viewed necessarily as a waivable right by
23
     you. In other words, you're not going to appear in
24
    handcuffs. I'm not going to allow that you appear in
25
     handcuffs before the jury or in open shackles. I'll give
```

```
you the Supreme Court law on that. That's not the question
 1
 2
     I'm asking you.
 3
              THE DEFENDANT: Well, I really don't know what is
 4
    right.
 5
              THE COURT: You have to speak up.
 6
              THE DEFENDANT: This right here in this jumpsuit.
 7
              THE COURT: What?
 8
              THE DEFENDANT: I want to wear the jumper right
 9
    here. I want to wear the jail issued clothes.
10
              THE COURT: So you want to wear, for your trial,
11
     jail-issued clothes?
12
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
13
              THE COURT: You understand that you will be
14
    provided, if you wanted to, street clothes, civilian
15
     clothes? Do you understand that?
16
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
17
              THE COURT: Do you understand that your attorney,
18
    Mr. Babineau, advises against you appearing in jail
19
     clothing? He just said that at the podium.
20
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
21
              THE COURT: It is your election to appear in the
22
     current jumpsuit, or one like it, in your jail jumpsuit at
2.3
     your trial?
24
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
25
              THE COURT: Let me ask you this. Now, you know
```

received the proper advice of counsel and/or the Court fails to object about being tried in his jail clothes, and here it's not an objection to being tried in the jail clothes, it's an absolute request under oath from the defendant.

The Supreme Court case that is on point is *Estelle v. Williams*, 425 U.S. 501. It's discussed around Page 508 through 512. It is well-established Supreme Court precedent. It was issued in 1976. So, consequently, this is not only someone who was brought into court for a jury trial in jail clothing, this is someone who actually request that they be tried in jail clothing.

I find that there is no constitutional violation, that the defendant has been informed that he does not have to appear in the jail clothing, that he has an option to appear in civilian street clothing, and that it will be provided for him. Under oath he has elected to proceed to trial in his jail clothes, i.e., his jumpsuit.

In contrast, I will further rule, so that it's clear, in regard to his restraints, in contrast to the clothing issue, appearing without restraints is not viewed as a right that is waivable by the defendant. Instead, actually shackling, this is in front of the jury, is, at a threshold level, "Inherently prejudicial" and as such is only permitted "where justified by an essential state interest." That's the Supreme Court case of Holbrook v.

Flynn, 475 U.S. 560, that is discussed at 568 to '69. It is a 1986 case.

Obviously, in a case such as this, at least for the handcuffs, if there does come a point where Mr. Perry is either proceeding *pro se* or with standby counsel, it will be difficult for him to proceed with access to the podium, documents, and so forth, and the Court recognizes this.

Accordingly, the Court does not permit at this juncture him to appear in restraints or shackling, visible restraints to the jury. The only way that that could be overruled is there appears to be "...an essential state interest" that is set out in *Brewster v. Bordenkircher*, 745 F.2d at 913. It's discussed at Page 916. It's a 1984 Fourth Circuit case.

However, there are also matters in the law that says that a defendant who has a history of any type of violent outbursts and threats, both in and out of court, that the Court should seek the marshal's advice. The case law says that the Court is entitled to "rely heavily on it." That, again, is in Brewster v. Bordenkircher, the Fourth Circuit case, and, obviously, given the history before this Court of this defendant, the Court will be making inquiry with the marshals about the proper security measures that are required, and if those measures then aren't adequate, then it will depend upon the measures recommended by the

marshal service, and the Court will go forward in that regard, whether some type of restraints are suggested.

There are restraints that can be put on a defendant that are not visible to a jury, such as the bandit device and other ways that the defendant, if they have the history that this defendant has, can be properly restrained for security purposes of the court, and when I say the court, I mean the attorneys, the court personnel, the marshals, and the integrity of the trial.

The Court always has to be concerned about the integrity of the trial, and that becomes an essential state interest, the integrity of the trial. So while at this juncture I am ruling that he will not be in any type of visible handcuffs or shackles before the jury, that the Court will discuss and inquire with the marshals and "rely heavily" on the marshal's advice and how to proceed in front of the jury.

So that is the Court's ruling in terms of him wearing what he is wearing today, the visible handcuffs and shackles, which the marshals recommended for today's proceeding, and that is the way we have proceeded today, but it is not before the jury.

So that takes care of the appearance, allowing him to appear in his jumpsuit before trial, not having handcuffs and leg irons or shackles on him, and, again, the Court will

proceed to make appropriate measures that will secure the integrity of the trial process itself as well as the safety of any other individual in the courtroom.

That brings us to the motion to inquire and the motion to withdraw.

Mr. Babineau.

MR. BABINEAU: Yes, Your Honor. The motion to inquire was, obviously, filed prior to the motion to withdraw. The motion to inquire was also based upon discussions between myself and Mr. Perry as to how to proceed with the trial.

As the Court knows, he has had three lawyers prior to me. I think it was Mr. Grindrod, Mr. Woodward, Mr. Hobbs, and then myself. Mr. Perry expressed displeasure with the way in which I propose to handle the trial of the matter, advising me that the same was with his prior counsel, and the advice that they were giving him, he did not agree with their advice, and that he wanted to, quote, fire me.

I advised him that there may be another option, or that the Court would consider that would be his right and that would be for him to represent himself at trial with standby counsel. At the time I put in the motion that would have been appropriate for me to at that time to remain as standby counsel because I didn't believe our relationship

had deteriorated to the point it had in the filing of the final motion in regard to my motion to withdraw.

But he did advise me that if nobody was going to help him, like nobody had, quote, that he wanted to represent himself. I advised him, again, about standby counsel, and he seemed to be accepting of that. So, hence, I filed that motion at the same time I filed the other motion relative to the jumpsuit, which the Court has addressed.

Want me to address the motion to withdraw, Judge?
THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.

MR. BABINEAU: Yes, ma'am. So after going to the jail on a number of occasions, Western Tidewater Regional Jail, probably somewhere in the neighborhood of about eight times or so in reviewing the case with Mr. Perry, including the discovery and the information that I received from potential witnesses in the case who he had asked me to subpoena a couple of whom, or three of whom I had interviewed, on March 3rd, when I appeared at the jail as contained in the motion that's been filed, discussing with him the case, he erupted into a violent outburst, yelling extremely loudly, like you could probably hear him outside this courtroom today if you were out on the sidewalk, and exhibiting extremely violent behavior, striking the wall and then the glass repeatedly with the receiver of the

telephone.

The corrections officers, during the visit, who came by and told him on at least two occasions to lower his voice and calm down, there were other folks back in the panel areas, and he did not. He just became more violent and louder and pacing around within the room until the outburst, in which he advised me that I was not going to be his lawyer, that I would not be around to be his lawyer, that he would make sure that I was taken out.

THE DEFENDANT: He lying, Judge.

MR. BABINEAU: Then two correctional officers, a captain and another corrections officer came into the room, not at my calling but because of the outburst and him hitting the receiver against the glass -- I was on the other side of the glass -- they forcibly removed him.

Subsequent to that, about three or four hours later I received a phone call from the United States, Assistant United States Attorney William Jackson, advising that agents had listened to a phone conversation from the jail to one of Mr. Perry's family members in which he advised the caller that he was going to "F" me up.

As a result of that, I contacted the Virginia State Bar, made inquiry from them as related to ethical matters that would be of concern as a result of that conversation.

In my belief, I had an affirmative duty to report what I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
believe to be, given his history, his characteristics, his
violent gang affiliation, that I needed to notify law
enforcement, which I did, and I notified the United States
Marshal Service, and I also notified the homicide violent
crimes lieutenant, Lieutenant Shaun Squyres, Norfolk Police
Department, who was in touch with the gang squad and others,
and as a result of his statements, I perceived them as a
real threat to my safety and security, and as such I'm not
in a position, because of the adverse situation that I'm in
with Mr. Perry at this point in time, I am not able to
represent him.
         I, quite frankly, Judge, I don't wish upon anyone
to sit next to him. I think he's violent, and somebody is
going to get hurt, and that would be on my mind the whole
time. I would not be in position to help him in his case.
         THE COURT: That would be even as standby counsel
at this juncture?
         MR. BABINEAU: Even as standby counsel at this
point, Judge. I've done a lot of soul-searching on it
because I want everyone to have a good defense. I've been
doing this for 32 years, as the Court knows, a long time
before Your Honor, this is the first time I've been put in
this situation in state court or Federal Court.
         THE COURT: Mr. DePadilla, is there anything you
want to say before I inquire of Mr. Perry?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DePADILLA: No, Your Honor, not at this time. THE COURT: I think if you can get the microphone to Mr. Perry, he can stand there at the table. THE DEFENDANT: Well, Your Honor, as he say, he came to the jail a few times and visit with me. I'm not disputing the facts of what he said about pertaining to the visits with me about my case and certain documents involving my case and the case strategy or whatnot. Some of the documents that I asked that I know for sure have been filed with the clerk of court to this court, I don't have them in the motion discovery. He doesn't even have the full motion discovery. He doesn't even have the videotape. He got a blank DVD of the crime scene, the officer's body cams. It is a blank DVD. I haven't even been able to go over all the facts of the case with Mr. Babineau at all. Certain documents that I asked him for, he hasn't been able to produce. Like I said, I'm not disputing the fact of my conversation with Mr. Babineau -- how can I put this? It might not have had went that way, but I never, in no form, ever threatened Mr. Babineau to his face, told him that I was going to do anything to him or sent somebody to get him or something, you know what I'm saying. I might have been mad when I talked on the phone

and said, you know what I'm saying, I would do something to

him, but I never told him that I would, you know what I'm saying, get somebody to do something to him or nothing at no time. That is a lie.

Like I said, he wanted me to agree to certain stipulations that I wasn't -- I didn't see fit to agreeing to at my upcoming trial, and I opposed to it, and I told him, and that's where we didn't see eye to eye on. But, like I said, he didn't even produce the full motion discovery yet, so I don't -- you know what I'm saying, there is a lot of things missing out of there that I don't have, you know what I'm saying.

When I left the office with him that day, when I left that visit with him that day, I tried to contact my old lawyer that I knew filed these documents, which was Andrew Grindrod, but he told me he couldn't help me, but he filed them via the computer electronically, so they are part of my motion discovery. But, as I said, I have yet to receive these documents.

THE COURT: Well, there are a number of things,
Mr. Perry, that you need to be aware of. Number one, at
this juncture, and when you were with Mr. Babineau, you are
not the lawyer, and you do not run the case. The lawyer is
there to make decisions and to file motions and to proceed
with the defense. So it's not you running the case; it's
the lawyer running the case.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

```
You have a lengthy history now with the Court.
This is the fourth attorney. Your statements here defy
credibility that you haven't seen the documents in your
case, because you've had four lawyers. Mr. Grindrod was the
first lawyer. He passed the file on to Mr. Woodward who
passed the file on to Mr. Hobbs who's passed the file on to
Mr. Babineau.
         THE DEFENDANT: I understand all that.
         THE COURT: Each of those attorneys have gone
through things with you and then reached a point where you
have your outburst and made it such that they could not
communicate with you.
         THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
         THE COURT: Mr. Perry, Mr. Perry, you may not
overtalk the Court.
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
         THE COURT: I'll give you a chance to talk, but you
may not overtalk the Court. I am telling you that there is
a record here. There is a history here. There have already
been four attorneys. Each of those attorneys have come very
close up to trial. You have been afforded legal
representation, and, as I said, you are not the lawyer.
There have been no stipulations filed against your wishes
here with the Court. So whatever wishes you have expressed
to your attorneys, there have been nothing filed here.
```

```
THE DEFENDANT: That's because he ain't filing.
 1
 2
     ain't filing nothing I asked him to file.
 3
              THE COURT: There are no stipulations. I said do
 4
     not talk over me, please. There are no stipulations filed,
 5
     and what you're saying, just again, tells the Court that
 6
     you're not going to listen to your lawyers.
 7
              THE DEFENDANT: You didn't even ask him if anything
 8
     that I said was true or factual. You didn't even ask him.
     I'm telling you, he has a chance to speak up right now about
 9
10
     everything I just said.
11
              THE COURT: I'm going to let him respond,
12
    Mr. Perry, but you were responding. I asked you to respond,
13
     and I'm telling you your history with the Court defies what
14
     you are saying, and you've had four attorneys. You've been
15
     through motions to suppress. I know you have seen the tape.
16
     I know that the tape is there.
17
              THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, but all my notes, when they
18
     sent me to Butner, they shredded all my documents. They
19
     shredded all my documents. And I know from ever since
20
     Andrew Grindrod has not been my attorneys, all the
21
     documents, on the motion to discovery, is some documents
22
     that's missing, and I been asking him about them.
23
     they, in fact, they exist. I want those documents.
24
     obligated to have them, right?
25
              THE COURT: What I'm telling you is that the Court
```

cannot overlook the fact of the history of this case, the fact that the Court knows that you have seen the tape, the Court knows that you have reviewed the tape with at least two of your attorneys.

THE DEFENDANT: One.

THE COURT: Okay. So who did you review it with?

THE DEFENDANT: Andrew Grindrod. That was the only lawyer I ever reviewed it with. After Andrew Grindrod was taken off my case, when Woodward retained -- when Woodward became my attorney, I was sent to Butner. They took all of my documents. They took my whole case file, and they shredded it. That is what I'm telling you. Certain documents that I know that should be in my motion to discovery isn't there, and I have been asking for them the whole time that Nicholas Hobbs was my attorney, that Lawrence Woodward was my attorney, and John Babineau, the whole time.

THE COURT: I will let the record speak for itself. There were motions to suppress that were continued under Mr. Woodward. It is a matter of fact and record in this court that the tape has been discovered. The tape has been reviewed in court and with the defendant. The motion to suppress has been heard, and I know there were two motions to suppress. They were heard. They were heard by Judge Miller, and then they became before this Judge on review,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
and they have been upheld. We are not going to revisit
motions to suppress. We are not going to revisit evidence
that the Court knows the defendant has reviewed.
         THE DEFENDANT:
                        Judge.
         THE COURT: If you keep talking over me, I'm going
to have to take appropriate measures, Mr. Perry, because the
Court has to rule.
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
         THE COURT: You are not entitled to talk over the
Court.
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. But --
         THE COURT: You are not entitled to talk over the
Court. As the Court was saying, his allegations defy the
record in this case, and I would advise you, Mr. Perry, we
will get to your representation in a moment, but the Court
will not tolerate a manipulation of the court system or the
integrity of a jury trial and continued antics and conduct
that are becoming historical in nature now over the long
time period that this case has been pending now. I believe
it was originally filed in July of 2018.
         We are on the second superseding indictment.
are on the fourth attorney, and each attorney is moving to
withdraw because of, at this point, his inability to
maintain any type of decorum and relationship with the
defendant, including Mr. Grindrod who moved to withdraw as
```

```
counsel from this case.
 1
 2
              So I'm just stating that as a matter of record, and
 3
     I have heard you, Mr. Perry, and you may be seated.
 4
              Mr. Babineau.
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: The record will speak for itself,
 6
     though.
 7
              THE COURT: Any response you want to make to the
 8
     defendant?
 9
              MR. BABINEAU: Just that I have a quite voluminous
10
     amount of discovery that I received passed down from lawyer
11
     to lawyer to lawyer, including a box that I received that I
12
     received from Mr. Hobbs which had notes going back to
13
     Mr. Grindrod and Mr. Woodward.
14
              So I have, I believe, a complete file. I just
15
     fully discussed the suppression hearings, the rulings and
16
     the suppression hearing, the evidence that was going to be
17
     admitted, as well as fully discussed the video and the need
18
     to have Officer Para, Investigator Para subpoenaed for trial
19
     in the case. It was, as the Court may or may not know, as
20
     Investigator Miller and Investigator Para were the two
2.1
     Norfolk police detectives who had the traffic stop.
22
              THE COURT: I'm well aware. I reviewed the video.
23
              MR. BABINEAU: I'm sorry, Judge. I keep thinking
24
     Judge Miller. Judge Miller conducted the hearing, but you
25
     reviewed it. I apologize. That Para, Investigator Para was
```

found maybe to be less than truthful in the testimony that he offered to the Court, but there was evidence and testimony from Para, as well as electronic evidence that was being admitted through the cell phone, and so I discussed all of that at great length, the case law associated with that, the reason for the superseding indictment relative to the firearm by felon with the Supreme Court ruling that required an additional element that the person knew at the time that he was a prohibited person by virtue of his felony convictions.

So we discussed that going into the jail on March 3rd. Prior to going into the jail, I spent -- Mr. Jackson will correct me if I'm wrong -- but probably 20 minutes on the telephone with him discussing a number of matters, including a stipulation related to the fact that he was a convicted felon so the jury would not hear the extent of his felony record or see any felony sentencing order that may otherwise be introduced into the trial of the case.

So the government was willing to enter a stipulation that would just say he was a convicted felon without more, which I told him was great for us because, clearly, they could prove he was a convicted felon, but we certainly didn't want the jury to know about the nature and the extent or the number of felonies because I think the government might be able to introduce more than just the one

felony into the record in the case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we did talk about that, as he mentioned. responding to that, I also asked United States Attorney Jackson about providing some audit information or some other body cam detail relative to officers that may have been at the traffic stop, including Para and Miller, if there was any detail related to times when the cameras were turned off or otherwise, which is an issue that he has, he meaning Mr. Perry, has raised with me. He actually raised it in a letter that was, I think, offered February 26 that I received in my office on March the 2nd, prior to my meeting with him on March the 3rd, and I had a conversation with Mr. Jackson about that type of information on March the 3rd, and I communicated that to Mr. Perry that I would be --Mr. Jackson would be making the appropriate inquiries and looking through what he had and would provide that information, if it existed, as quickly as he could get his hands on it.

In addition to that, I wanted to talk to him about jury instructions because he had some, he, meaning Mr. Perry, had some specific questions about jury instructions, and so I asked Mr. Jackson in that same phone conversation if he would forward jury instructions to me because he had already prepared them since this case has been prepared for trial for a long time and that the

government had already done jury instructions.

I asked him if they were standard book instructions, if you will, and he said no, there were some that had some nuances to them, and I wanted to be able to see those and go over them with Mr. Perry because Mr. Perry was concerned about jury instructions.

So he and I had some very fruitful, many very fruitful discussions. I don't go to the jail just to hang out and chat with my clients. I go there, it's work, it's business. I want to know as much about their case, and I want to give them every bit of information they can. Every time he came to me, he never claimed he lost any notes or anything of that nature.

In any regard, he came truly with two hands with piles of paper. He has transcripts of the proceedings. He has copies of the discovery. He has — would fill up a banker's box of papers each time he came back and forth, and sometimes I would tell him, "Tell him don't bring the papers. He and I are going to talk about some things that we don't need the papers. We are going to talk about some case law and some other things." So I would suggest that his suggestion to the Court is inaccurate.

THE DEFENDANT: Lying again.

THE COURT: Mr. DePadilla, is there anything you want to add to that? I'm also going to ask Mr. Jackson to

```
verify what has been said, but is there anything you want to
 1
 2
     add in response to either Mr. Babineau or Mr. Perry?
 3
              MR. DePADILLA: Only, Your Honor, that over the
 4
    pendency of this investigation and prosecution, we have
 5
     worked with each one of Mr. Perry's attorneys. When
 6
    Mr. Grindrod made requests, we got him information.
 7
    Mr. Woodward made requests, we got him information.
 8
    Mr. Hobbs became lawyer, we dealt with his requests. At
 9
     every juncture the government has tried to give Mr. Perry
10
     what he's wanted in this case.
11
              As Your Honor fully pointed out, he's viewed the
12
     tapes at the suppression hearing. We played them ad nauseam
13
     literally from the beginning of the traffic stop until the
14
     last possible moment.
15
              THE DEFENDANT: It won't tapes from my attorney.
16
     It was tapes from the prosecutor and from U.S. Government.
17
              MR. DePADILLA: As far as his latest request for
18
     new body cam footage, we are now two years plus from the
19
     time of the traffic stop.
20
              THE DEFENDANT: I don't want the body cam footage.
21
     I want the audit.
22
              THE COURT:
                          Do you have any body cam footage?
23
              MR. DePADILLA: No, Your Honor. It would not be
24
    maintained because you have to make a mark in the system to
25
     save it for trial. Since those weren't trial witnesses, and
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

```
we'd already turned over Para and Miller, and these hearings
had gone forward, no, there aren't any more tapes, to the
best of my knowledge.
         THE DEFENDANT: I don't want the tape. I want the
audit.
         THE COURT: Mr. Perry, I'm going to give you a
chance to respond.
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.
         THE COURT: But I have to hear what Mr. DePadilla
is saying to the Court so I can be sure there is nothing
else out there that we can get to your attorney.
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, but he's mistaken.
want the tape. I want the audit. I want the documents
saying how many times his video camera stopped, his axon
camera stopped, when did he cut it on, when did he program
it when he came on the shift. I want the audit from it.
         I have Officer Miller's, but I do not have Officer
Para where Officer Para testified to certain things at the
hearing, and I would like the audit from this camera. I
would like that.
         THE COURT: Don't say anything else while I ask
Mr. DePadilla certain questions.
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
         THE COURT: Now, Mr. DePadilla, let's get straight
on the cams and whatever you have. I have seen the tapes
```

```
that were offered on the motion to suppress.
 1
 2
              Now, are there any other body cams or tapes
 3
     available, let's say, video at this point?
 4
              MR. DePADILLA: Right. Based on our going back to
 5
     Norfolk, there are no more tapes that exist at this time.
 6
              THE COURT: Now, are there any audio recordings?
 7
              MR. DePADILLA: No, there are no audio recordings
 8
     either.
             What Mr. Perry is asking for is what is called an
     audit, a-u-d-i-t, trail, which the computer showing when the
 9
10
     body cam was on or off. We will attempt to get Para's audit
     for Mr. Perry. I believe, if I may have one second to check
11
12
     with Mr. Jackson.
13
              THE COURT:
                          Wait just a minute. Audit, a-u-d-i-t?
14
              MR. DePADILLA: Yes, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: I thought he was saying audio. So it's
16
     audit, a-u-d-i-t. Do you have audit trails for the tapes?
17
              MR. DePADILLA: We do not current have one for
18
     Para, but we do believe the computer will save that, at
19
     least I can make that representation to the Court. We
20
     believe, based on the prior experience with Norfolk, that
21
     would exist. So we will go now and pull the audit and see
22
     where he ends up with counsel so it can get to Mr. Perry at
     some point.
2.3
24
              But all that's going to show, Your Honor, is when
25
     Officer Para's camera was on and off. As Your Honor well
```

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

```
remembers, Officer Para's camera didn't start in a timely
fashion, right. He's the officer whose camera doesn't come
on until five or six minutes into the traffic stop.
Officer Miller's camera who is there the entire time taping
it, and that's what we are going to sponsor at trial,
Miller's cam.
         THE COURT: Let me ask you, let's go to Miller's
     Miller's cam, there would be no audit trail?
         THE DEFENDANT: I got it.
         THE COURT: He has the audit trail?
         THE DEFENDANT: It stopped multiple times.
         THE COURT: So you've got the Miller body cam, the
video, and you've got the Miller audit trail, and those have
been produced to counsel?
         MR. DePADILLA: Yes, Your Honor, those have passed
over to the defense.
         THE COURT: Now, in terms of Officer Para, you have
turned over the body cam, and I know the issues about it
starting, but you have not turned over any audit trail, and
you need to inquire whether there is one?
         MR. DePADILLA: Yes, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Have you been asked for an audit trail
before?
         MR. DePADILLA: May I ask Mr. Jackson because he
was working with Mr. Babineau.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: Yes.
 2
              MR. DePADILLA: No. This is the first time we have
 3
    become aware of it so we will try and satisfy that request
 4
     at this time.
 5
              THE COURT: So, in other words, you, in your
 6
     discovery, didn't fail to turn over an audit trail, I want
 7
     that to be clear, you did not have an audit trail?
 8
              MR. DePADILLA: No, Your Honor, we did not. We are
 9
     not going to sponsor Officer Para at trial based on what
10
     happened in the suppression hearing. But we will still
     supply what the computer, if it exists.
11
12
              THE COURT: Just answer my questions.
13
              MR. DePADILLA: Yes, Your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: So we have a clear record. Let's go to
15
     Officer Para. His body cam, we know the issues about it
16
     starting late. You did not fail to produce an audit trail
17
     that you had?
18
              MR. DePADILLA: No, Your Honor, we did not.
19
              THE COURT: That needs to be clear for the record.
20
              MR. DePADILLA: Yes, Your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: So you didn't fail to produce an audit
22
     trail that you had?
2.3
              MR. DePADILLA: That is correct, Your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: Is that correct?
25
              MR. DePADILLA: Yes, Your Honor.
```

```
THE COURT: You think one exists, but you don't
 1
 2
     know?
 3
              MR. DePADILLA: I cannot make that representation
     to the Court, but we will inquire if it does exist.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Will have to probably be tomorrow since
 6
     we are already at 4:00 today, you will immediately inquire,
 7
     and you will inform the Court and whatever the state of
 8
     counsel is at that point in time?
 9
              MR. DePADILLA: Yes, Your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: If it exists, you will get it and
11
    produce it?
12
              MR. DePADILLA: Yes, Your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: Now, have you failed to produce it on a
14
     request? Has anybody requested it before now?
15
              MR. DePADILLA: No, Your Honor.
16
              THE COURT: So from Grindrod, none of the four
17
     attorneys has requested that you look for audit trails of
18
     Officer Para?
19
              MR. DePADILLA: Right. That is correct, Your
20
     Honor.
21
              THE COURT: So that needs to be clear for the
22
     record. In other words, an audit trail may or may not
23
     exist. If it does exist, you're going to ask for it and
24
    produce it, if it does exist, and it is not something that
25
     you have failed to produce upon a request from defense
```

```
counsel?
 1
 2
              MR. DePADILLA: That is correct, Your Honor.
 3
              THE COURT:
                          Is there anything else you want to add?
 4
              MR. DePADILLA: No, Your Honor.
 5
              THE COURT: Now, Mr. Jackson, if you could confirm,
 6
     you heard what Mr. Babineau represented to the Court about
 7
     discussions with you regarding stipulations. Is there
 8
     anything you want to add or do you agree with him?
 9
              MR. JACKSON: Nothing to add. I agree with what he
10
     said, represented about our conversations.
11
              THE COURT: I wanted to be clear, the government
12
     then offered, at least in terms of stipulations, a
1.3
     stipulation that everyone would agree he was a convicted
14
     felon?
15
              THE DEFENDANT: No, I --
16
              THE COURT: I'm asking you, Mr. Jackson.
                                                        Is that
17
     what the government offered?
18
              MR. JACKSON: Yes. The stipulation was to him
19
     being a convicted felon and to knowing of that prohibited
20
     status.
              THE COURT: Consequently, you would not plan to
2.1
22
     present the nature and extent of his criminal record?
2.3
              MR. JACKSON: Yes, Your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: Unless there is something else you want
     to add?
25
```

MR. JACKSON: Nothing else, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Perry, you can stand up there. You've heard Mr. Babineau, he doesn't agree with what you've said, and you've heard that Mr. Jackson does agree with what Mr. Babineau said, and you've heard that Mr. DePadilla has said they will endeavor to get an audit trail of Mr. Para.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that, but what I was trying to tell you in the beginning is they never, since the suppression hearing, that Lawrence Woodward never played the DVD on Mr. Jackson. He played the DVD, his DVD, his recording, and the one that Babineau has, that Mr. Jon Babineau has is blank, you know what I'm saying. What I'm saying is the audit from it, the time stamp, I had that for Officer Miller. That was entered into the record at that suppression hearing.

But Officer Para's, you know what I'm saying, we already know his testimony was fraudulent in itself, but let alone I want the audit to, you know what I'm saying, to go back and see whether the camera was on or off because we don't know.

All we know is what he testified to, but we know he's a liar so how can we believe anything that he says, you know what I'm saying. I'm not going to go off what he said. I want the discovery. I want the evidence. I want the evidence that back, you know what I'm saying. When he came

```
and talked to me, like I said, I didn't discuss a lot of different matters with Mr. Babineau as far as things that I wanted to be filed, you know what I'm saying.
```

For, one, I don't see how the USA could take all these dispositions as to, like you said, we on the second superseding indictment, you know what I'm saying. You deal with the facts and only the facts, but he can take how many dispositions he want. He can say, well, okay, I know this dude ain't truthful, but I believe this and I don't believe that. I don't understand that, you know what I'm saying.

It was certain things that I wanted to be filed, and, like I said, I talked to him numerous times, and he just do what he want to do, know what I'm saying, not what he should be doing, which is right, and, in fact, I never argued with anything outside of the law, his job. When he say, well, I don't agree with you on this. I said, well, Mr. Babineau, can you show it to me? Can you show me the case law citing?

THE COURT: Well, you've heard the discussion on the audit trail, and that is going to be pursued.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, am I going to get it?

THE COURT: Wait just a minute, Mr. Perry.

THE DEFENDANT: Am I going to get a copy of the actual DVD?

THE COURT: Wait just a minute, Mr. Perry. You

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
have heard the discussion about the audit trail of Officer
       It has not been requested before. It has not been in
the United States' possession. They think it may be in
Norfolk, and they will proceed to request it. Where it goes
from there, we are not there yet. The point is the audit
trail, your request has been heard, it has now been made,
and they are going to pursue it.
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
         THE COURT: Now let's go back to the motion, and I
want you to understand, Mr. Perry, that you have been under
oath during this entire proceeding.
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
         THE COURT: You understand that you're still under
oath?
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
         THE COURT: Now, we are on to Mr. Babineau's motion
to withdraw as counsel. That's what the Court has to decide
right now, is whether he withdraws as counsel and then what
occurs in terms of your representation.
         I will not offer anything at this point other than
the Court has to determine on his withdrawal as counsel and
whether you proceed then pro se, proceed with new counsel or
proceed with standby counsel. That's not before the Court
yet. What is before the Court at this juncture is what
Mr. Babineau has represented that has occurred between the
```

```
two of you.
 1
 2
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
 3
              THE COURT: That did not comfortably communicate
     with you and is not at all comfortable with representing you
 4
 5
     for the reasons that he said.
 6
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
 7
              THE COURT: Do you agree with his motion to
     withdraw?
 8
              THE DEFENDANT: I mean, I don't oppose to it.
 9
10
     don't agree to what he testified to, but I don't oppose to
11
    his motion to withdraw, no. That's his position.
12
              THE COURT: Do you want him to represent you?
1.3
              THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
14
              THE COURT: Because, I mean, he's not out of the
15
     case unless I tell him he's out of the case. Do you want
16
    him to represent you?
17
              THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
18
              THE COURT: So you agree with his motion to
19
     withdraw as your counsel?
20
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I don't agree with what he
21
     testified to. I don't agree with it.
22
              THE COURT: Are you getting along with
2.3
    Mr. Babineau?
24
              THE DEFENDANT: I mean, at this point, um, he wants
25
     out. Like I said, everything that he said wasn't true, but
```

```
he want out. Why would I go to trial with somebody who
 1
 2
     don't want to be a part of it.
 3
              THE COURT: Do you want him to be a part of your
 4
     case?
              THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
 6
              THE COURT: You may be seated.
 7
              Is there any further inquiry you want the Court to
 8
     make in regard to your motion, Mr. Babineau?
 9
              MR. BABINEAU: No, ma'am.
10
              THE COURT: Any further inquiry that you want the
11
     Court to make, Mr. DePadilla?
12
              MR. DePADILLA: No, Your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: Well, I first want to say on the record
14
     that if the Court allows this motion, this will be the
15
     fourth attorney who has moved basically on the same grounds
16
     in some form to be relieved of counsel, the last three, in
17
     particular, out of violent outbursts towards them and their
18
     representations on the record, many of which are documented
19
     through what occurred in lock-ups at the jail, and there
20
     have been outbursts, obviously, in court.
21
              What the Court wants to add to that at this point
22
     is these are four of the best attorneys that appear before
23
     this Court, and their longevity alone before the Court may
24
     come close to a total of 100 years. I don't know if you
     start adding up the number of years that they have been
25
```

practicing. Mr. Grindrod is an outstanding public defender.

THE DEFENDANT: The best attorney I had.

THE COURT: As are the attorneys in the public defender's office. Then you have Mr. Woodward, who I know has at least 30 years of experience because I have been on the bench over that period of time, and Mr. Hobbs, who may not have 30 years, but he has a lot of years of experience and appears regularly before the Court on criminal cases.

Mr. Babineau, who I know for a fact has appeared for at least 30 years before the Court. So that you've got four of the most experienced attorneys, all of whom have appeared repeatedly before this Judge, and all four of which I don't know that they have ever -- they may have, but if they have had a motion to withdraw from a case outside of a conflict of interest, I don't recall any such motion.

So I'm going to put all of that on the record. On the other hand, the Court has to be aware of the right to have counsel represent the defendant, and the Court has to be aware of the communications that need to go forward between counsel and the defendant.

I would first say that I do find Mr. Babineau credible. His representations before the Court have been confirmed through the marshal service, with the jail, at least in terms of the conduct, not necessarily the words but the incident occurred, the phone call occurred, the

stipulations been confirmed through Mr. Jackson, and I have never had Mr. Babineau or any attorney, frankly, say that they didn't even want to sit at the table with the defendant.

Consequently, the motion is semi-timely. We are still at least about three weeks from trial. The Court has inquired into the breakdown across the board, and the Court would conclude that, again, this relationship is resulting in a total lack of communication. It appears that Mr. Perry wants to be his own lawyer and run his own case and is not going to agree with any attorney.

In any event, obviously, Mr. Babineau cannot proceed, and he has represented that he just cannot present an adequate and fair defense given his perceived seriousness of the threats. Basically his motion suggests, and he said in court that it's impossible for him to present an adequate or a fair defense given his perceived seriousness of the threats and his feelings at this juncture about the defendant.

So, consequently, I grant the motion to withdraw on certain conditions. Number one, it's not effective until I enter the order or say the order is effective. Obviously, Mr. Babineau has to turn over all files to any new counsel, and I will determine how that will be done, and given the order, but you are not under any further obligation to me or

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
proceed with the case at this juncture, Mr. Babineau, with
Mr. Perry, but you are under your ethical duty as an officer
of the Court to maintain the file and turn it over as
directed by the Court. Do you understand?
         MR. BABINEAU: Yes, ma'am.
         THE COURT: I will issue a written order that
relieves you of representation as of the conclusion of this
hearing except for your duties as an officer of the Court to
maintain the file and see that it is properly preserved and
turned over to new counsel or as appropriate who the Court
orders.
         MR. BABINEAU: Yes, ma'am.
         THE COURT: You, obviously, have to stay for the
rest of the hearing.
         MR. BABINEAU: I am. I'm staying, Judge.
         THE COURT: That brings us to the point, Mr. Perry,
determining how to proceed yet again in your case.
believe the last time the Court told you that this was the
last counsel that would be appointed. I, however, will
still obviously listen to how you wish to proceed. It's up
to the Court to make the legal determination of how we are
going to proceed, but I will still hear you on the
methodology about which you proceed, but at some point there
is case law, I haven't gotten to that point yet, where if
the Court can't find an attorney to represent you, then the
```

```
Court has to determine at that point how to proceed in the
 1
 2
     case.
 3
              So you're still under oath, Mr. Perry. If you
 4
     would stand up and tell the Court whether you wish the Court
 5
     to try to find, and I don't know, frankly, at this point who
 6
     is available to represent you that has the requisite
 7
     experience and ability to deal with the case, but you're
 8
     under oath, and I will ask you whether you wish the Court to
 9
     endeavor to appoint another attorney to represent you?
10
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
11
              THE COURT: Whether you want to represent yourself,
12
     if you represent yourself, whether you wish standby counsel.
13
     That is, obviously, ultimately a decision for the Court,
14
     whether you have standby counsel or not. So at this
15
     juncture how do you wish to proceed?
16
              THE DEFENDANT: I'll stand on my Sixth Amendment.
17
              THE COURT:
                          Sir?
18
              THE DEFENDANT: I said I wish to stand on my Sixth
19
     Amendment, my right to counsel.
20
              THE COURT: You want the right to endeavor to
21
     appoint another counsel to represent you?
2.2
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
2.3
              THE COURT: Do you wish to represent yourself?
24
              THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.
25
              THE COURT: So you do not wish to represent
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

```
yourself. Do you understand then if I appoint counsel, it
is counsel's decisions that control in the case and not
yours?
         THE DEFENDANT: What you mean?
         THE COURT: In other words, you can't keep firing
your counsel, as you say, or threatening your counsel, as
you say, just because they don't agree with you.
         THE DEFENDANT: I didn't threaten Mr. Babineau.
         THE COURT: I find to the contrary. I am telling
you that.
         THE DEFENDANT: I didn't threaten him.
         THE COURT: Mr. Perry, you cannot keep threatening,
intimidating counsel, and you can't keep firing them because
they don't agree with you. That doesn't mean that counsel
won't abide by what you ask. In other words, Mr. Babineau
didn't file any stipulation. Mr. Babineau didn't agree to
any stipulation, but you cannot get angry with him and you
cannot threaten him.
         THE DEFENDANT: I didn't.
         THE COURT: Because he offers something to you that
has been offered by the United States or he's giving you a
trial strategy. I am just telling you you cannot do this,
and I find to the contrary. I found Mr. Babineau to be
credible.
         THE DEFENDANT: I'm telling you.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
THE COURT: What he said to the Court has been
corroborated by the other matters in the case. So I'm
asking you, do you want new counsel?
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
         THE COURT: Do you understand that counsel is the
one who is running the case, not you?
         THE DEFENDANT: I think so. I think I understand.
I really -- I really -- at the end of the day, the only
one -- this is my life on the line here, you know what I'm
saying.
         THE COURT: That's what the Court is concerned --
         THE DEFENDANT: If we come to agree on case law or
something like that, you know what I'm saying, I'm willing
to work with a lawyer and meet them halfway. I was willing
to meet Mr. Babineau halfway. As I said, Mr. Babineau gave
me some advice, and I asked him what was the case law to
back it. He never produced it.
         THE COURT: I'm not going to repeat myself anymore.
I'm just saying that if the Court can find a new lawyer to
represent you, it's the lawyer's responsibility to make
filings and to suggest a defense to you, and, in fact, it's
his duty or her duty under the law to pass on to you
anything the United States offers. If they offer
stipulation, he has a legal duty to tell you. If they offer
a plea agreement, he has a legal duty to tell you.
```

```
THE DEFENDANT: I understand.
 1
 2
              THE COURT: You do not have to accept it.
 3
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
              THE COURT: When you don't accept it, he doesn't
 4
 5
     file, but he has a duty to guide your defense. Do you
 6
     understand?
 7
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
 8
              THE COURT: Then you can be seated.
 9
              Frankly, at this point I may have to go out of the
10
     area to find an appropriate defense counsel, but I will
11
     endeavor to appoint new counsel as quickly as I can. Until
12
     such time, the trial date stays on the docket. I don't know
13
     whether if we can find new counsel or what will happen, but
14
     the trial date stays on the calendar.
15
              Mr. DePadilla, go ahead and request these audit
16
     trails, and if you are able to get them, you should turn
17
     them over to new counsel, and you should so advise the Court
18
     with a copy to counsel that you've gotten them.
19
              Mr. Babineau, you are to retain your file and turn
20
     it over to new counsel when appointed.
2.1
              MR. BABINEAU: Yes, ma'am.
2.2
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
2.3
              THE COURT: Yes.
24
              THE DEFENDANT: Can I ask, can I just ask what --
     could I have an actual copy of the DVD, like? Could it be a
25
```

```
copy with the footage up there? Can my counsel be appointed
 1
 2
     a copy -- all the Cox video cam footage on the DVD?
 3
              THE COURT: The DVD that was in evidence with the
     Court?
 4
              THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. Yeah. Could my counsel be
 6
    provided a copy, actual footage of it because the one that
 7
    Mr. Babineau has is blank.
              THE COURT: It's in evidence. I have viewed it.
 8
              THE DEFENDANT: My counsel, he has a blank.
 9
10
              THE COURT: I will ask him.
11
              THE DEFENDANT: It's blank.
12
              THE COURT: I'm going to ask Mr. Babineau. A copy
13
     of the DVD that is in evidence here in the court?
14
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
15
              THE COURT: You have seen it. I have seen it. All
16
     the counsel have seen it. Counsel had been passing it
17
     forward.
18
              THE DEFENDANT: He evidently haven't seen it.
19
              THE COURT: Mr. Perry, please. Let's maintain the
20
     decorum here.
21
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
22
              THE COURT: I'm doing the best I can to be sure you
23
     get what it is that you want to see and you need.
24
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
              THE COURT: I know it's preserved in evidence. I
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
know that as a fact because it was played, it's part of the
suppression hearing. So I can assure you there is a DVD,
and I can assure you that I have seen it and you have seen
it. I can assure you that if for some reason counsel
doesn't have it, I can't imagine they don't, but if they
don't, you will.
         THE DEFENDANT: Ask him.
         THE COURT: I'm going to ask him, Mr. Perry.
Mr. Perry, if you would please be seated.
         Mr. Babineau, do you have a copy of the DVD?
         MR. BABINEAU: I do, Judge. I actually have five
DVDs, including Mr. Grindrod's file on the DVD, jail calls.
In addition to that, Mr. Grindrod and I had a conversation,
and he has copied, re-copied some other documents that he
had from his file that he's not sure whether they were
passed on, and they are at the desk at the Federal Public
Defender's office, and when I leave here today, I will swing
by there and pick them up, and I will have them, too, so I
will pass them on to the next lawyer.
         But I'm confident that everything that Mr. Perry
wants is contained within the DVDs that I have in my
possession.
         THE COURT: I'm looking at you holding them.
That's what you're holding up?
         MR. BABINEAU: Yes, ma'am.
```

THE COURT: Thank you.

2.3

Then we will, in a moment, conclude this proceeding, and in summary, the jury trial remains for March 31 at 11:00 a.m. in this court.

Number two, the Court will be inquiring with the marshals about proper security measures to maintain the integrity of the trial process.

Number three, the Court will, at the conclusion of the hearing, allow Mr. Babineau to withdraw and have no further communication or contact with the defendant with the one condition that he pick up any documents that are awaiting for him at the Federal Public Defender's office, that he makes them part of his file, and that his complete file is then turned over to the new attorney. In the order I am going to direct the new attorney to contact all of the previous attorneys to be sure they have all of their files.

In other words, I will put that in my order that new counsel shall contact the Federal Public Defender. The next one was Mr. Woodward, and then the next one was Mr. Hobbs, and the next one was Mr. Babineau to be sure that they have everything, that they passed on everything to new counsel of the defendant. That should be the Federal Public Defender. Mr. Grindrod is passing everything on to you. So be sure you sign for those papers.

MR. BABINEAU: Yes, ma'am.

```
THE COURT: So we will see that everything is
 1
 2
     assuredly by court order with the next attorney. In the
 3
    meantime, I consider this as basically the defense's motion
    for new counsel at this point because I've got to find new
 4
 5
    counsel. So that's where we are in the process.
 6
             Is there anything you want to add, Mr. DePadilla,
 7
    Mr. Jackson?
             MR. DePADILLA: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
 8
 9
             MR. JACKSON: Nothing, Your Honor.
10
             THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Babineau?
11
             MR. BABINEAU: No, ma'am.
12
             THE COURT: Then I think that the Court has
13
    considered all the outstanding matters, and we are trying to
14
    go forward towards the current trial date, which remains on
15
    the Court's docket. The Court stands in recess until
16
    tomorrow.
17
             (Hearing adjourned at 4:23 p.m.)
18
                            CERTIFICATION
19
20
         I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
21
     from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
22
              X____/s/___
2.3
24
                        Jody A. Stewart
                        X 2-8-2021 x
25
```



